

No bills or receipt sent to individual subscribers.

NEW YORK, MARCH 11, 1900.

Agents sending in subscriptions without remittance must state distinctly how long they are to run. Agents are personally charged with and held responsible for unpaid subscription sent in by them.

Only duly elected and approved agents acknowledged.

MILWAUKEE.

Keep an eye on your wrapper. See when your subscription expires. Renew in time. It will prevent interruption in the mailing of the paper and facilitate work at the office.

THE PEOPLE.

Published by the Socialist Labor Party, Henry Kuhn,
National Secretary, at 51 Beekman street,
Room 305, New York.

EVERY SUNDAY.

TERMS TO SUBSCRIBERS.

Invariably in advance.
One year, 100 copies, \$5.00
Six months, 50 copies, 2.50
Single copy, 10 cents

Bundle rates: Less than 100 copies, 1 cent a copy; 100 to 500 copies, 1/2 cent a copy; 500 or more, 1/4 cent a copy.

As far as possible, rejected communications will be returned if so desired and stamps are enclosed.

Entered as second class matter at the New York Post Office, on April 6, 1891.

SOCIALIST VOTE IN THE UNITED STATES.

In 1888 (Presidential).....	2,068
In 1890.....	18,331
In 1892 (Presidential).....	21,157
In 1894.....	33,183
In 1896 (Presidential).....	36,564
In 1898.....	82,204
In 1899.....	85,231

In the silent halls of death,
Then go not, like the quarry slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon, but, sustained and soothed
By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave
Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams.

—BRYANT.

THE MURDER OF MIKE DEVINE.

In a revolution, the first bloodshed is always the rallying point for a clarion call to arms. The Socialist Revolution, for the present at least, is being forwarded at the ballot box; and if there is one thing that should be used as a clarion call during the coming campaign it is "The Murder of MIKE DEVINE." Members of the proletariat have before this fallen beneath the murderous missiles of the capitalist class, but this is the first time in the history of the Socialist Labor Party that a man wearing an Arm and Hammer button has been deliberately bounded to the grave.

A number of months ago a Section of the Socialist Labor Party was organized at Burke, Idaho. Among the charter members was MIKE DEVINE. And when the miners were corralled in the Bull Pen, of course MIKE DEVINE was there. Pneumonia attacked him, and, strong and robust though he was, the beastly sanitary conditions of the Bull Pen sapped his vitality, and he knew that he was facing the grim specter.

He pleaded that his wife and child might be allowed to see him.

"No!" thundered the capitalist brute in charge of the prison.

His friends pleaded for him. "The man is dying," they said.

"No, and again no!" cried the military lackey of the Republican President McKINLEY.

Then—
With the glaze of death in his eyes and the death-rattle in his throat, he raised himself on one elbow, gave one last loving look at his fellow-prisoners, and shouted:
"BOYS, DAMN THESE MURDERERS! STAND BY THE UNION! DON'T SIGN THE PERMIT! THEN HE FELL DEAD."

And MIKE DEVINE, a member in good standing of the Socialist Labor Party, and a worker for the Socialist Republic, was murdered.

Well does Stanislaus Cullen say:

Seventeen hundred and seventy saw Yankee men shot dead
In fifty-nine JOHN BROWN was hanged—
read ye the omen red
King GEORGE went down, Black slavery died,
Ye capitalists mark the sign:
Ye told the knell of your system's rule
when you murdered MIKE DEVINE.
Listen, O Workers, and answer: How shall we best serve the Cause
He was murdered for defending? How best change the brutal laws
That they tortured him to death with?
Heed the words of MIKE DEVINE:
Vote to own the mine and workshop, For the Robber Class don't sign!

In the Bull Pen at Wardner, the capitalist class dealt its first bloody blow to the Socialist proletariat and made a breach in the front ranks of the militant army of Socialism. But from his grave a hundred crimson banners will wave, and in his place a thousand stalwarts will stand. And when the day comes that the flag of the Socialist Republic shall float from every flagstaff in the nation, then we will build

a monument fine
With the broken chains of the wage-slave,
In memory of MIKE I—ine.

Close up the ranks!

JULIAN PIERCE.

WHY "PHILANTHROPY" HALTS.

Elsewhere in this issue will be found a chapter from MARX' "Capital" on the laborious poor, showing the needlessness of these to capitalist society, and how they actually constitute the mine from which is drawn the affluence of the capitalists, and upon which their wealth rests. The article also shows with citations from distinguished capitalist economists that, while the relieving of the wants of the poor is a wise act, yet the curing of the evil would be folly, inasmuch as it would cut off capitalist society from its base of supplies. These observations explain a certain phenomenon that is of frequent recurrence, and

that is otherwise puzzling, to wit, the halting attitude of Philanthropy.

When the "Philanthropist" starts in, he wraps himself in a cloak of humane phrases: the love for his kind seems to dominate his mind: "do unto others as you would be done by" seems to be his guiding star. And yet, ere one knows, his course begins to veer. He whose mind is dominated by love for his kind, whose conduct is guided by the principle to do unto others as he would be done by, cannot but be anxious to cure, as well as alleviate, pain; with such a person, the idea of stopping short of a cure, much more so the deliberate preventing of a cure, and deliberate nursing of the ill must be wholly absent from his mind; and utterly repellant must to such a person be the idea of nursing the evil itself, so as to have a perennial opportunity to exercise philanthropy. Not so the "Philanthropist." He will go so far and no further. He will alleviate, but not cure; the proposition to cure is decried by him with all the invectives at his command.

Of this we are just being furnished with an illustration by Philanthropist JACOB S. RITS. The tenement house system he loathes: it breeds, untold evils among the poor. Now, then, does he set his cap to abolishing the tenement house system? Oh, no! His whole aim is to "reduce the evil." The tenement house breeder of whole volumes of ills is to have its wings clipped so that it may breed only half volumes; and as to destroying the capitalist system itself—that microbe one of whose secretions is the tenement house system impurity—perish the thought! Not only would Philanthropist RITS not be so "unpatriotic," he does his level best to uphold the putrid microbe by singing the praises of one of its pillars—THEODORE ROOSEVELT, of improved policeman's club reputation.

As stated in the pamphlet "The Class Struggle," now about to be republished by the Labor News Co.:

Poverty is felt by the capitalist class to be a source of danger for the whole social fabric; it breeds famine, pestilence and crime. Accordingly, a few of the more clear-headed and more humane among the capitalist class are willing to do something for the proletariat; but the bulk of these, who neither dare nor can afford to break with their own class, the problem is not the abolition, but only the alleviation, of poverty. To abolish poverty were to abolish the proletariat, and that is not their purpose. The proletariat is, by all means, to continue, able to work and satisfied with its condition. This is the extent to which capitalist philanthropy goes, or can go.

The working class must rely upon itself alone. It must itself be the bestower upon itself of whatever good things it is to enjoy. All other sources are but sources of degrading alms and fettering slavery.

THE DAILY PEOPLE is approaching visibly and audibly to those who have eyes to see and ears to hear.

Close observers will have noticed that the present PEOPLE has been going through a period of transition during the last three weeks. It is now set up on its own linotype machine, in its own composing rooms—a step towards the daily; furthermore it is set up in the type of the daily papers. These preparatory steps for the event of next July 1 have not been unaccompanied with technical difficulties. These were virtually overcome last week, and are wholly overcome now. The net result of the change so far is that THE PEOPLE contains nearly two more columns of reading matter, due to the difference in type.

Another change, not quite so pleasant to the readers, is that they will receive the paper somewhat later than usually. It has been found advisable to go to press a day later so as to give time for communications and other matter to go in. At any rate, under the new regime, THE PEOPLE will be mailed Thursday morning early.

Mr. Lyman Abbott, a Reformer and lecturer, has brought the art of humbug, common to reformers and professional lecturers to perfection.

In a recent lecture on the Social Question, he says in one place:

It is something that every man in America owns himself.

And just before that he says:

We abolish feudalism, and there springs up in its place a capitalistic system, in which all the tools are owned by the few, and the many can work only with the consent of the owners.

Now which is which?

A social system, in which "the many can work only with the consent of the few owners of the tools," surely can not be a social system in which every man owns himself. The man who, can not work; i. e., live without the consent of another, whatever he owns, surely does not own himself. It consequently must follow that in America, where this social system exists, every man does not own himself. But Mr. Lyman Abbott says that in America "every man does own himself." What is the sequence? Either that we have no capitalist system in America, in which case Mr. Lyman Abbott neglected to say what we did have, or that we do have capitalism here and Mr. Abbott is carrying water on both shoulders telling a bit of truth to make his lecture tart and then slobbering the truth over with a bit of blarney not to frighten away moneyed backers of his lecture tour.

Such are the Cagliostro's of this generation!

A Grocers' Trust was started last week in Boston; at least the attempt was made. The affair was unique. It betrayed better than anything yet has the moon-calf make-up of many of our fel-

low citizens, the illuminating fact of the occasion being that, at the conclusion of the speeches, the hat was passed around to take a collection to start the trust. The magnificent sum of \$17.13 was collected, and the announcement thereof was greeted as "a step towards the goal."

Between these Trustifiers and the "Socialist" colonizationists, like Mr. Leonard, the "Socialist" candidate for governor in Maine, who schemes a colony of 100,000 people, each depositing \$100, and thus beginning with \$10,000,000, the country is sure to be kept in a roar for some time to come.

The "Socialist," James F. Carey, of Massachusetts, must by this time be making the painful discovery of the truth of the saying that is imputed to Lincoln to the effect that you may cheat some people all the time, and you may cheat all the people some time, but you can't cheat all the people all the time.

He appeared recently in Providence, R. I., where he was announced to deliver the first of a series of lectures in which he was to annihilate the Socialist Labor Party. He delivered his first lecture, and that was also his last. The reception he got was not encouraging. The audience was too hard-hearted for him.

The consumption, appendicitis-in-the-legs, erysipelas-in-the-nose, rheumatism-in-the-ear and other dodges of sickness in his and in the body of his family, with which he seeks to captivate sympathy, left the audience unmoved, even caused him to be gayed.

Sic transit gloria dodgi!

The Empire State Society of the Sons of the Revolution held on the 28th of last month an exciting meeting in the city, during which excitement a variety of patriotic pussies leaped out of a variety of bags. One was a circular issued by one of the members in which the following passage occurs:

Two years ago this society rose against tyrannous and unheard-of high-handedness on the clique who have ridden the organization since its birth and smothered them. Why do these people struggle so desperately to keep themselves in office? Because they are interested in a printing concern that monopolizes the printing of our society, an item of tremendous expense during the past two years. Most of it is uncalled for and unnecessary.

These Sons, interested in printing and other concerns, and who utilize their Sonship so as to turn the flow of the circulating medium into their pockets, may serve a purpose, however round about, in the scheme of nature. They serve as foot notes on patriotism.

What has been wrongly called the "Labor Movement," is just now making an odd exhibition of itself.

Id Chicago "organized" Labor and "un-organized" Labor are organized in mutual warfare in the building trades.

Here in New York, "pickets" of the International Typographical Union are hunting up the wives of the Sun's employees and telling them that their husbands are not at work at all, but spending their time with fast women.

What does this all mean? The Labor Movement? No! The Class Struggle? No!—It means a wrangle for jobs, in which intellectual and physical effort is put forth against one another by fellow-competitors, upon the same mean and criminal plane that small and big traders fight one another.

Pure and simple methods are not even remotely the methods of the Labor Movement—they are repellent to the Labor Movement. They are caricatures of the methods of the bourgeois.

Never before in its history has the Party had so many agitators in the field as since its striking arm became free, by the dumping of the reactionists.

Keep is touring Ohio; Schulberg, Connecticut; Maloney, Massachusetts; Peter Damm, the Middle States; Dalton, the Rocky Mountain States; Hickey, New York and New Jersey; and Indiana is preparing to put a man in the field for the purpose of organizing glassworkers and coal miners' Alliances; Colorado, Utah and California are arranging with the same object. Besides these, numerous other tours of shorter length are springing up constantly.

What with this, the DAILY PEOPLE and the increased activity of the Labor News Company, the Party is evidently in A No. 1 fighting trim.

POLITICAL and ECONOMIC.

The Seattle, Wash., *Pacific Wave*, a publication of the students of the University of Washington has a lengthy article on the platform of the Socialist Labor Party recently adopted in its city for the municipal campaign. The criticism is friendly, but both that which it approves and that which it disapproves denotes much greenness.

It is, in the first place, a sign of greenness to ignore the general principles of Socialism enunciated in a Socialist platform, pick out a few planks of local demands for immediate enforcement which lose all sense, or acquire a very different sense, when taken apart from their context, and then bestow praises upon them. This is just what the *Pacific Wave* does. For instance:

The *Pacific Wave* speaks approvingly of "free baths," "municipal hospitals," etc., and declares these to be things already found in many American cities. To imagine that these things, demanded by Socialism, have any feature essentially alike to the things one now has, is a blunder into which one can fall only when he looks at the "demands" apart from the Socialist principles that precede them, and from which they follow. What we now have are essentially charitable concerns, and needs must be so seeing that they proceed from capitalist principles, which need for their basis a poor and pauper class, and which, accordingly needs charity. What, on the contrary, Socialism demands is the sequence of a social system, whose basis, so far from being poverty, is the affluence that the worker can enjoy and is entitled to. Such things are "house of

a different color." The approval of them must be upon ground different from the approval of charities.

Again, the *Pacific Wave* has misgivings on the score of calling capitalists "respectable criminals." It censures the Socialist Labor Party platform for using the term on the ground that such terms "are more apt to lose votes than to gain them." This also proceeds from a misapprehension of the situation. Whose votes is the Socialist Labor Party apt to lose for using such language? The *Pacific Wave* evidently must mean capitalist votes. If it devotes a little study to Socialist literature, that is to say, to sound literature on sociology, the *Pacific Wave* will discover that for the Socialist Labor Party to bait its hooks for capitalists' votes would be as robust an act of folly as for a fisherman to bait his hook for trout in mid-ocean; he would catch neither trouts (which are not there) nor redneppers (which are there); ditto, ditto, with a Socialist Labor Party platform worded to catch capitalist votes.

Among the "International Notes" of the London, England, *Justice*, the following item is found:

The Massachusetts Socialists have joined the New Socialist Party.

Shades of the Goddess Confusion! What is that "New Socialist Party"? When was it born? Where? What does it stand for? Whence came it, and on what occasion was it joined by "the Massachusetts Socialists"? On all these subjects people in America are wholly uninformed, seeing they know nothing of the "New Party," or of defection of Socialists, in Massachusetts or elsewhere, to it.

If our European friends take no more care about what they publish on America than, judging from this and similar items, they are in the habit of doing, their readers' minds will be in as confused a condition on American affairs as Artemus Ward found his stomach to be in after a week's diet of potato-and-fish hash in Oberlin College.

In pursuit of its decision announced in these columns last week, to boodle with the Democratic party in the approaching campaign, the *Pueblo*, Col., *Courier* is now out with articles against "government by injunction," just the same as Altgeld, when two years ago, he, the inventor of the phrase, stumped Missouri for a Democratic judge whose prominence had been gained by issuing savage injunctions against workmen on strike.

The Leipzig, Germany, *Volkszeitung* has an article in which the startling passage occurs:

The National Liberal leader Tichendorfer recommends, as a means whereby to "neutralize" the Socialist trade unions, the entrance of non-Socialists in those bodies.

In other words, the German capitalist is coming up to his American brother. In Germany, on the continent generally, the capitalist methods of chicanery have so far limited themselves to the market, they had not yet invaded the political field. This invasion is a symptom of a high degree of capitalist development, and has long been reached here. It is now being reached in Germany. The labor fakir and his dupe-tool, the pure and simple union, are now looming up there too as capitalist weapons. If our comrades in Germany are wise, they will drop the triviality of looking upon the Labor Movement of America as "a confused kink of petty quarrels," study it intensely, and profit by its teaching. They have much to learn from America, and if they neglect to equip themselves with the information gathered here, they simply invite trouble upon their own heads.

The Tokyo, Japan, *Labor World* contributes on its English page the following bit of information on the way capitalists look upon Socialists:

The Sociological Association has had two debates on capital punishment and decided in favor of abolishing hanging. A point made by an Imperial University man for supporting the Imperial University of the honorable institution as well as interesting. We will give it to show our readers how the Imperial University spirit dominates the Imperial University. The square-capped gentleman said somewhat in this strain: We oppose the abolishment of the capital punishment, because we have before us a possible growth of Socialism and communism, and this poisonous principle will surely come to conflict with our nationalism (a narrow, bigoted foreign-hating and misquid patriotism fostered purpose for self-gain to the noble institution and its sons) and we must put down these kamish Socialist and hang them in honor and glory of our Nationalism.

Such a spirit, though fostered and held up by our Hakuishi and Gakuishi, ought to be condemned to CAPITAL PUNISHMENT while we still have the law.

Lectures.

BRADDOCK, PA.
March 11, 2 p. m.—Agitation meeting, S. L. P. Headquarters, corner Ninth and Braddock avenue. Members of Braddock, McKeesport, Wilmerding, East Pittsburgh, Fort Henry and Homestead are especially invited.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.
March 11, 3 p. m.—Thomas A. Hickey, "Uncompromising Socialism." Orchestra Hall, 5 Beersum street.

MARCH 11, 8 p. m.—B. B. Hughes, "Blind Samsons." Wurster's Hall, 315 Washington street.

DETROIT, MICH.
March 11, 2:30 p. m.—R. B. Meyer, "The Socialist Labor Party and Reform Movements." 313 Gratiot avenue.

MARCH 12, 2:30 p. m.—Henry Ulbricht, "Collective Social Effort." 313 Gratiot avenue.

EAST NEWARK, N. J.
March 12—Harry Oakes, "The Socialist Labor Party." Ball's Hall, corner Grand and Central avenues.

NEW YORK.
March 9—Thomas A. Hickey, "Uncompromising Socialism." Headquarters, 80th Assembly District, 1706 First avenue.

MARCH 9—Julian Pierce, "Capital, Capitalism, and the Capitalist System of Production." Club Rooms, 481 Willis avenue.



Uncle Sam and Brother Jonathan.

BROTHER JONATHAN.—I am tired of all these political discussions that are going on. It makes my head swim to see them in the papers. It is row, row, row. "Gold standard," "double standard," "protection," "Socialism," "expansion," "anti-expansion," "Populism," "Imperialism," heavens know what all! I used to read up on all that and take an interest in the political issues. But I won't any more. I am going to drop it all, and mind my own business.

UNCLE SAM.—That might not be a bad idea, provided the political issues too dropped you and did not interfere in your "business."

B. J.—Well, I won't let them interfere.

U. S.—What is your "business?"

B. J.—I have a little grocery store.

U. S.—And you imagine you could run that uninterfered with, if you interfere with nobody?

B. J.—Why, of course.

U. S.—Can you get along without customers?

B. J.—How foolish you talk. Of course I need customers.

U. S.—Now suppose that the employers of your customers reduce their wages, will they have as much to expend in groceries as before?

B. J. (with an angry look that tells "I have been there")—No, won't have as much.

U. S.—Can you prevent it?

B. J.—No.

U. S.—Why not?

B. J. (impudently)—How you talk!

U. S.—You can't prevent it, eh?

B. J.—Course not!

U. S.—Consequently the loss of revenue of the men will interfere with your business, eh?

B. J. bites his lips.

U. S.—You know that the machine displaces workmen, don't you?

B. J.—Yes.

U. S.—Every new machine puts out workmen, and every improvement puts out some more, eh?

B. J.—Yes.

U. S.—Now suppose the employers of your customers get new machines, what becomes of the others? Will they have any money to buy groceries from you?

B. J. (anxiously still)—No, they won't!

U. S.—Consequently the conduct of the employers interferes with your business, eh?

B. J. grows quite red in the face.

U. S.—But that's not all. Have you not heard of the department stores?

B. J. (walking backwards and forwards impatiently)—Have I heard of them? HEARD of them? HEARD of them? By Jericho! I've HEARD of them, and FELT them, too.

U. S.—These large capitalist concerns are more attractive than the little ones, eh?

B. J.—If that were all! They can afford to sell so much cheaper; and they take our customers right from under our noses.

U. S.—Just so. These large concentrations of capital interfere, will ye nil ye, with your business?

B. J.—Yes, yes, yes.

U. S.—Whether you will or no?

B. J.—Yes; will I or nil I—

U. S.—Thus you see, my good man, that there is no such thing as running away from, or dropping the political issues of the day, or turning your back upon them. They won't drop you. They will hold you fast. What good does it do you to run away, if they can and do overtake you?

B. J.—Now what is a man to do?

U. S.—Even a rat pursued turns to bay, and shall man do less?

B. J.—What good will turning to bay do?

U. S.—The good that fighting always does. It starts the settling of the question. No question is ever settled until it is settled right. The fight will and must continue until the right cause prevails.

B. J.—But who is to tell which is right?

U. S.—The prevailing, finally prevailing, one always is the right cause.

B. J.—And in the meantime?

U. S.—Everyone should fight as hard as he knows how for what he considers the right thing.

B. J.—Well, I for one don't know which of all these is right.

U. S.—And yet it is as easy as rolling off a log to know what course a man should take.

B. J.—I find it damned hard.

U. S.—Look you here. Is it to your interest to live or starve?

B. J.—Why, of course, to live.

U. S.—Is life becoming easier or harder?

B. J.—Harder, by thunder!

U. S.—What makes it harder for you?

B. J.—The inability of people to buy as much as before.

U. S.—And what makes that harder?

B. J.—I'm stumped!

U. S.—Did you not realize that the machine pauperized your customers, and the large stores underbid you?

B. J.—Yes.

U. S.—Does the machine cause less

goods or more goods to be produced?

B. J.—More, immensely more.

U. S.—Stick a pin there. And, taking it as a whole, which is more sensible, a lot of small stores or a few large and well stocked ones?

B. J.—The large ones, but where would I come in?

U. S.—You realize that the machine produces infinitely more than hand work, hence you must realize that there is something wrong somewhere in that, despite increased production, there is increased poverty. You realize that a large store is better than many picky ones, hence there must be something wrong if, despite such advantage, there would be people who suffer by it—

B. J.—That's all right, but the money?

U. S.—Can "Expansion," or "Anti-expansion," a Gold standard or a Silver standard, or Protection, or Free Trade remove these evils?

B. J.—Don't see how they could.

U. S.—Nor does anybody else. Now suppose that the machine, and the land and the factories were owned by the people and operated by them, would there be any idle capitalists to sponge on all the property of the people, reduce wages, throw men out of work and thereby make the whole community suffer?

B. J.—Guess not.

U. S.—That's all the milk there is in the coconut. And that is Socialism. And that is what you should fight for.

THE "BULL PEN."

A Scathing Criticism of Capitalism and the Labor Fakir.

The vigor of a political

